

**Virginia Workforce Council
Richmond Marriott Hotel
500 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia
October 18, 2004
Minutes**

I. Call to Order – Chair Marjorie Connelly

Chair Connelly called the meeting to order at noon. The public comment period to come later was announced.

II. Roll Call – Members Present

Marjorie Connelly, Chair	Hugh Keogh
Michael Daniels, Vice Chair	Daniel LeBlanc
Senator J. Brandon Bell, II	Senator Yvonne Miller
Delegate Kathy Byron	Robert Myers
G. Trigg Copenhaver	Hiawatha Nicely
James Copp	Rita Ricks
Mark Dreyfus	Don Sullenberger
Dolores Esser	James Underwood
C. Michael Ferraro	Andrea Wooten
Richard Gonzalez	

III. Approval of the Minutes – Chair Connelly

The minutes of the June 15, 2004 meeting were approved.

IV. Lieutenant Governor Timothy Kaine

Dr. Bolin introduced the Lt. Governor. He spoke of the challenge facing the Council in setting direction for the entire workforce system in the state, including regional issues, the allocation of resources and program direction. Many things are going well, but there is clearly much more to do in that there are not many areas that are more important than focusing on how to strategically increase the skills of the workforce around the Commonwealth. The Lt. Governor quoted language from “Virginia Economic Trends” —from an article by James Bacon called “Doss Human Capital,” his joke on Marxus' famous “Doss Capital,” but he is basically saying that, “It is not *Capital* that is the issue, rather it is *Human Capital* that is the issue.

In the knowledge economy, the force driving the movement of capital investment is not the price of commercial real estate, access to roads and utilities, tax rates, or even financial grants and inducements. High levels of knowledge and skills are associated with increased productivity. They can also foster R&D activity, entrepreneurship, and innovations. So, it is in building a structure that helps people better attain knowledge and skill at all levels; high school, community college, middle college, and work force training programs that are not necessarily associated with degree programs. .

Obviously, the educational institutions and opportunities are not geographically situated evenly around the Commonwealth and so we have regions that have more need than others, but your job is to take the resources that are available for workforce development and training, and make

sure that first, we are spending them in the appropriate way, but always with the thought in mind that this is what it takes to have an economy that is strong. Lt. Governor Kaine also cautioned the Council not to shy away from the challenges regarding structural changes. Don't hesitate to embrace those structural challenges. Not only how the money is reused, but also what are the best ways to merge the efforts so that they are used in the most effective way. The economy is changing so fast there is not any reason that we should not continually examine our structures and the way we deliver our services, because they may need to change just as fast as the economy is changing.

V. PY 2004 Local WIB Strategic Plans – Katherine DeRosear, Director of Policy & Planning, Office of the Special Advisor

Ms. DeRosear indicated that last March the Council provided guidance to the WIBs for strategic plan development and there are four basic elements required in the strategic plan: 1) a strategic direction for the local area which included the vision, mission, and goals for that local work force investment region; 2) to identify measurable goals and strategies or objectives; 3) brainstorming strategies for leveraging resources and the process with the community partners; and 4) how to create community awareness about the strategic plan and the strategic direction of the WIB and how it aligns with the Virginia Workforce Council, and how to create awareness locally about the Virginia Workforce Network Centers and the partner programs. All 17 WIBs met the deadline for submission of their strategic plans. They are now working on their operational or action plans to support the strategic plans. The Council's meeting package contained a summary of the strategic goals for the 17 WIBs.

The Local Excellence Committee recommended that we provide you with just a list of the goals, because those seem to be what was most important to the Committee in determining if the WIBs are moving to a higher level of functioning, as desired by the Council. The goals that are highlighted are those goals that address the incumbent workforce. All local boards were also required to address one of the two other sub-systems; either the K – 12 pipelines or the worker's with barriers. You will see a diversity of goals based upon the local needs. Local Excellence Committee Chair Andrea Wooten indicated that the Committee recommends approval of the strategic plans.

Chair Connelly asked whether the strategic goals line up well against any gaps in WIB performance? Ms. DeRosear responded that the strategic plans address the need to build a workforce system. The next part of the process is the development of an action plan where the WIBs will identify specific strategies and metrics for accomplishing these goals. The WIBs have not gone through the process of developing all the measurements yet. The Action Plans are due November 1st 2004 as are business plans submitted for their local Virginia Workforce Network Centers. The same review process will occur and the Local Excellence Committee will make a recommendation to the Council for approval. A motion was made and seconded to approve the 17 WIB strategic plans.

Summary of Local Community Profiles – Dr. Fletcher Mangum

The community profiles were done for the WIBs to provide an empirical basis on which they could build the strategic planning process. The 17 WIB community profiles are available on the Virginia Employment Commission's web. The data included economic, demographic, and education statistics. The VEC had the lead role in producing the community profiles with some assistance from

Dr. Ann Battle, a senior economist with the Virginia Economic Development Partnership, and I was under contract with the Virginia Community College system to provide the education statistics. Each region differs and each WIB differs. Those details are in the individual profiles. There were three major findings that came out of the community profiles if you look at them for the state as a whole. One of them is that, 1) between 2000 – 2010, almost every workforce investment area in Virginia will experience a major increase in the proportion of its population that is 55 and older. The reason is the demographic landscape that is controlled by three demographic waves; the first is the baby boom, the second is the echo boom [their children] [much smaller], and as the baby boom moves on to retirement, the number of bodies that are left afterwards to fill the holes that they are going to create is smaller than the baby boomers themselves. As a result, laborers will become something of a scarce resource and as with any scarce resource we are going to have to use them efficiently. The importance of workforce development and workforce information in terms of allocating that scarce resource is going to be dramatically elevated.

Second, most of the employment growth that is going to occur in the Commonwealth over the course of the next decade is going to be in services and in retail trade. If you look at the occupational growth projections, what you see is that the occupations that are scheduled to grow by the largest number [or proportionally] are home health care aids, healthcare education RNs, LPNs, Orderlies, and technology [computer support specialist, system analyst, and computer engineers], and in education [secondary teachers and also teaching aids. Increases in health professions, education, and also technology are going to drive much of the training requirements within the Commonwealth. That training requirements forecast, based on the Virginia Employment Commission's occupational projections, was part of each one of the workforce investment boards' community profiles. 3) As we look forward, there will be a significant shift away from employment in manufacturing and also government employment towards services. This is going to significantly impact certain regions.

As you move away from those jobs and toward employment in education and health care, one of the implications is likely to be somewhere downward pressure on wages and on certain WIBs. For example, in workforce investment area 1, wages in the manufacturing sector were the seventh highest of any of the industrial sectors within that area. As we allocate employment away from that sector toward the service sector, what we find is in the retail trade, wages are the 19th highest in that workforce investment board and education – 15th, health care – 12th. Compare that to manufacturing as 7th.

Mr. Ferraro asked whether the strategic plan addressed the demand plan requirement for each WIB? The answer was that requirement will be met when the action/operational plans are Mr. Ferraro's concern is the commitment from the pipeline to the plan. At least up North at the local level, I don't see the commitment of the pipeline to the plan. I'm hoping that we see a connection of the pipeline, which is really out of our world of responsibility other than a community college, to the plan. I mean it's nice to go through the planning process, but if there's no commitment to meet the plan, why make the plan? The K – 20 pipeline; that is the pipeline I am referring to. My concern is there's no commitment, at least I have not seen one at the local level, from K-20 to meet the demand plan that the local workforce board is spending time and resources to obtain.

Dr. Bolin indicated that there was a requirement that the strategic goals from each WIB address the incumbent worker subsystem and at least one other goal addressing either the worker pipeline (P-20) or workers with challenges. Therefore, all local operational plans may

not include the pipeline. This was just the first round. Next year, the Council could require the WIBs to address all three of the subsystems.

VI. Council's 2004 Annual Report to the Governor – Gail Robinson, Staff

Ms. Robinson indicated that the 2003 Amendments to the Council Statute require the Council to report annually to the Governor on certain areas. Those areas are: the Council's accomplishments related to policy advice to the Governor; activities related to the policy direction that the Council is providing to the WIBs; activities related to current and emerging statewide workforce needs; activities related to forecasting and identifying training requirements; and activities related to strategies to match trained workers with available jobs. Many of the Council's accomplishments this year are the end result of the Council's initial work, which culminated in the 2002 Strategic Plan. The issues raised in that plan have emerged either in state law or in state policy under this Administration. These are enumerated on pages 2 – 5 of the report.

Then the accomplishments are discussed in each of the aforementioned areas. The report concludes with a discussion of future activities. We will also add an appendix that will include performance information for the WIBs, the incumbent worker program, and for the rapid response program. Mr. Ferrara requested that the Virginia Workforce Network Center locations be listed in the Appendix and that will be done. The report will be sent to the Governor in November. Chair Connelly asked for a motion to approve the report. A motion was made and seconded and the report was approved.

Chair Connelly indicated the Council continues to be interested in performance and this may be the "year of the metric." Chair Connelly reported that her goal as it relates to the annual report, is to make the report a workforce performance report, which goes beyond a discussion of programs and activities.

VII. WIB News
Systems Measures, Danny Inge, Region 2000/Central VA WIB Director

Mr. Inge provided two handouts on "financial management ratios" and a set of definitions. This is related to the WIB's interest in determining our results from a business perspective. We are in the efficiency business and this is a set of ratios and it is divided into two parts. One is a budget – what did we plan to do? And then, under the heading "Actuals" – how did we end up doing financially? These are the end of year (June 30th) numbers. From this, you can see some interesting things, and this has been presented to the WIB Directors, and it met with universal interest. However, this is a way that WIB 7 is looking at this. From a budgetary standpoint, the funding ratio is important, i.e., between WIA and other funds. Last year we were able to generate about \$60,000 through our economic development partnership. That funding has begun to diminish and one of our goals for this year is to increase the amount of additional funding that we get. If you look at our fiscal year 2004 budget you will find that we only have about \$3,000 that we have definitely been able to generate.

However, I think one of the most positive things that has happened in working with VEC, the Department of Social Services and partners, they have developed a brand new senior level MOU. We have generated over \$100,000 of in-kind support for our career center, so we are beginning to see that progress. It does not show up here as an actual dollar, but there is a lot of support for what we are doing. One of things that I feel is lacking from the WIA is some designation of the expectation for WIB support. I don't believe you can run a WIB without a

director, without an office, etc —without some ability to have money set aside for initiatives. So these dollars are the planned dollars to support our WIB operations. The reason it looks higher this year is because we have set aside about \$100,000 specifically for WIB initiatives; that is things that we see as economic development opportunities or opportunities to participate within our community to improve things. For instance this year, in our budget, we are participating with the regional Commission and the regional Economic Development Partnership to have a grant writer available to us part-time, and to hire an existing business contact person. And that person will individually contact, along with our Career Center manager when he needs it, about one hundred of our most significant businesses this year, and will contact two hundred in future years. The funding is that other than money paid for an ITA. Under the heading Programs: that is the dollars we have set aside to spend on our Virginia Workforce Network Center programs. Under Career Center Efficiency: that is a measure of what it costs to serve core clients; people who came through our doors, but did not need to go beyond those core services that include job search, computer literacy, etc. So we spent about 24% of our funding keeping the doors open to the Career Center. If you look at the efficiency measure, we had 6,343 folks come through the door and we spent about \$32.60 on every core customer.

We have a central full-service Virginia Workforce Network Center and we have opened our first test facility in Appomattox County where we have a kiosk that is there all of the time, and then a counselor that visits on a scheduled basis. The cost of the WIB offices, a percentage of the total of our spending was 12%, our fiscal agent, which we obtained services through our regional commission, was 3% of our cost, our career center total program expenses, that is to run the career center, was 29% of our budget. We had 193 ITA's (individual training accounts), and that ranged from OJT through nurses training, that cost us \$2,598.07 per person [of course, that is an average]. In our youth training we funded two programs; one was managed by Lynchburg School System and was inclusive of all the local school systems and it was a summer with year-round follow-up that gave those qualified children to choose between either a summer job or experiential learning. The other program we ran was an alliance between the community college system, the alliance for families and children, and the Jubilee Center, its one of the innovative and hard working service organizations.

Ms. Wooten asked Mr. Inge what he thought were the top two or three barriers to you being even more successful than you have been? Mr. Inge indicated that WIB 7 started as a new entity and everything had to be built from scratch. The barriers are several; one is, over time there has been a lack of consistency and understanding of what the desire is from the state level. The best thing we have seen in that arena lately is the State MOU. Obviously, the idea in WIA that resources are consolidated is not a fact. Second, the idea that under WIA that somehow all of the workforce programs are going to be consolidated through the career centers is just not working, and is probably not workable. At the local level, we have been directed to coordinate with our partners. I can guarantee you that while we have good relationships, we have many partners, and we have an awful lot of in kind support, no local manager, whether its VEC, Community Colleges or DRS has the budget or the authority to just change their priorities over night to write me a check. The other thing that I have frustration with, and it is part of the metrics and performance discussion, is the current WIA 17 measures, which in most cases make little sense to me. I'm not sure that the times we live in match up to what was expected when they came up with the measures. A measure that asks, "how much did you increase a person's income from their old job to present" doesn't seem relevant when we are losing manufacturing jobs in the Lynchburg area, and replacing them with service jobs, and the people that leave the manufacturing jobs don't have a high school education so they start with GED preparation. I can guarantee you that it is difficult for us to match the old wage, much

less see an increase in that wage. Finally, I think the biggest challenge for us has been with the VWN or the computer system. It seems complex and it has been dragged out over a very long period of time, probably because we've got multiple states involved and all of those things, but the problem for us at the end is that we have had a difficult time just getting a hold on what it is that we are supposed to do.

Richmond WIB Pilot – Michael Evans, Richmond Director of Human Services and Gary Fletcher, Richmond WIB Director

Chair Connelly indicated that the Council recommended a \$225,000 grant to the Richmond WIB and the City to improve services integration through co-location and to improve employer services. We will now hear about the goals for this project.

Mr. Evans began by indicating that in his portfolio of agencies and responsibilities fall a number of human service agencies, as well as the staff liaison to the WIB. I want to offer the context about why this grant is important to the City of Richmond. The City has some unique conditions that make it well suited to benefit from this grant. There are three particular goals of City Council that focus on the mesh between this grant and the outcomes that we are looking for. Richmond houses 70% of the central Virginia region's poor within its boundaries. So 21% of our 200,000 residents live at or below the poverty level. We have another section that lives marginally just above that poverty level and float in and out of poverty from time to time. As a result, we have concentrations of people who do not have access to the employment marketplace. We have people who want to work, but don't have the skill sets to obtain gainful employment, and unfortunately, we have limited system capacity to serve these populations. Our budgets are far too inadequate to handle the great demand that we face in the city. Another strategic goal of City Council is to expand employment options to youth, ex-offenders, and the welfare-to-work population to increase and sustain their successful participation in the workforce. Finally, in addition to these issues around poverty, is the relationship that workforce services have with economic development. We have segments in our community that don't yet understand that workforce and economic development go hand-in-hand. We want to make sure that we create seamless linkages with our regional economic development agencies to support business development and business retention. We want to be there to mesh those economic and workforce development interests, to make sure that we can support the economic development of the region, of the city, and to make sure that the citizens of Richmond have first crack at any jobs that get created. Mr. Evans recognized Marilyn West, Chair of the Richmond WIB, who was in the audience.

Mr. Fletcher spoke next and he provided 2 handouts. The first handout shows how the strategic plan of the Richmond WIB and the City's strategic plan link together. We are still working on the strategies and deliverables, so this is a preliminary copy, and there is still a lot more work to be done on this by the WIB and the City. The second handout is designed to give you an overview of the partnerships we are continually developing with both mandated and other partners that we work with around the City. Even though we have not completed the complete work plan for the model, we are moving forward. .

Mr. Fletcher was asked with regard to the partners, which partnerships seem to work the best for you and which ones have not worked so well? And, how has the WIB business partnerships really worked? Mr. Fletcher indicated that he was not sure that he could really say that some partnerships work better than others. For instance, AARP is a co-located partner. They have three people in the Virginia Workforce Network Center on a day-to-day basis through out the entire day offering services to older workers. The Community Colleges provide training to

about 250 of our customers per year. The answer to the second question is that we need a lot more business partners co-locating in our Centers. Some of them don't have the resources budgeted in order to co-locate with us. We hope through the model funds that we can bring some of them in, assist them in this co-location, so that over the next year they will be able to see how important it is for them to be co-located and they will begin to budget funds to be able to move in with us the following year, and many years to come. But, we work with organizations like the Greater Richmond Chamber of Commerce, the Metropolitan Business League, the Hispanic Chamber, and the Virginia Chamber of Commerce, to really reach out as a facilitating agency to the business community. There are some companies that offer job fairs, for instance, monthly in our centers—we work extensively with Home Depot.

Ms. Wooten asked Mr. Fletcher the same question posed to Mr. Inge. If you could identify two or three barriers to achieving even more exceptional results than you have, what would they be? Mr. Fletcher indicated that the co-location is always a real problem. Again, it's a financial response from many of the partners.

Mr. LeBlanc remarked that it would help the Council is to know what the employment demand is. For example, if we knew approximately and by region how many people needed to be placed for the jobs that might be there, that would help us to know whether the WIBs are meeting the demand that is there. Perhaps we could have that information for the next meeting. Dr. Bolin responded that she and the WIB Directors would work on getting as many of those pieces of data that we can.

VIII. Virginia Workforce Network Center Performance – Brian Davis, Staff

Mr. Davis indicated that Mr. Ferraro requested a report on Virginia Workforce Network Center performance. On the surface, that seems like a simple and easy question. However, we don't have a simple and easy answer. We surveyed the 17 WIBs and received 5 responses. What you have to remember is that in Virginia, we have about 90 Virginia Workforce Network Centers of different sizes, shapes, and varieties. Forty-four of those are classified as comprehensive centers. But even where you have co-location of programs, you still do not have an integration of performance measures. Each individual program has its own performance measures that they have to report to whatever their funding authority is, so in a lot of cases, local areas and local programs are just keeping their heads above water, tracking what they need to track to report. This report is not a side-by-side comparison of common Virginia Workforce Network Centers' measurements in Virginia. This report is a framework for the results of a survey that I have conducted, in order to give you an idea of what types of information at a Center level are being collected in Virginia right now. I think that when I start to walk through those, you will begin to see some elements of things that could be collected for the system, regardless of which program a person is being served by.

Mr. Davis provided a handout, reflecting the 5 responsive WIBs. Even where the WIBs are collecting some of the same information, they are collecting it at different time periods; some areas report on a monthly basis; some areas report on a quarterly basis; some areas report on an annual basis. If the Council decides to set up a quarterly reporting requirement, that would begin to make it easier to do side-by-side comparisons. Additionally, the number that people are collecting from area to area varies; some areas collect information by the person; some areas collect information by the service; so you could have one person receiving 7 services compared to another area that is just collecting services and your not going to get an even balance of who is doing what, and how they are doing it in comparison to other areas. I think you can see from the chart that there is a lot of information that is being collected out there

locally, and there is even more beyond what I condensed on this chart for you. But what this chart does for you is it gives you an idea of common elements that are being collected in some of the same areas and that might be a good base to begin some of your discussions on next month on systems performance measures. The elements down the left side are elements that are collected in more than one local workforce area, but not all. If you look at it, they are basic, straightforward, common sense element.

Regarding potential common elements, once the resource room visits captured, then you are enrolling them into a program, and it doesn't matter which program you are enrolling them into—you could capture what information is currently being presented. Some areas even break the enrollments out into a ratio of new clients versus existing clients, which give you a little more detail into whether you are continuing to serve the same people, or if you are getting a new influx of customers. Also, how many people, once you have gotten them into the program, are you exiting out of the program and what are they earning, and what was the cost to serve them during the time that they were enrolled in the various programs. Some areas are breaking it down into the types of services they received, whether they are receiving the intensive services and exiting the program, or are receiving training services. Another thing that I point out in my brief description that came out with your chart is that some other areas also get into a lot more detailed information that might be important for that area. For example, Alexandria collects information specialized to certain populations such as the Hispanic or the homeless. If the state identified some common special populations that it wanted to track information on then those could be included also. Or again, it could be left to each local area to add those one. In closing, this quick chart gives you evidence of the need for some common measures across all programs in the Virginia Workforce Network Centers, regardless of what programs are represented in the Centers themselves, in order to have a better understanding of what the system as a whole is doing.

A question was asked about whether from looking at the data, were there any common denominators throughout that created extensive problems to be able to track, or did you see metrics that you felt like should be, in your opinion, that are not being tracked?

Mr. Davis responded that the metrics that are listed down the left side of the handout seem to be common basic elements that should be able to be captured, e.g. who's coming in the door, are they getting enrolled into a program, when did they exit, are they placed in the job market, et cetera.

Another question that was asked was whether Mr. Davis could see a need for dividing the metrics between primary and secondary, where primary might be the ones that are important to the Council statewide and secondary might be metrics that are area specific, e.g. homeless? So you might have primaries that we would use to gage ourselves statewide and then secondaries, which really wouldn't count in a statewide measure. Mr. Davis responded in the affirmative.

Another member asked for an explanation of intensive services? The term applies to WIA. There may also be other individual programs that offer the types of services that are classified as intensive. Basically, a summary answer is, once you get more into a one-on-one type of relationship with the customer and find that you may need some counseling and more detailed staff assistance, rather than self-service. Additionally, Mr. Davis was asked why clients are exiting the program and where are they going? Mr. Davis said that hopefully, they are exiting because they have obtained employment that leads to self-sufficiency. The WIA program requires 12 months of follow-up after they exit and similar programs have similar requirements for follow-up.

Ms. Wooten requested that in preparation for the Council's systems performance measures meeting next month, she would like to know whether the WIB Directors have had any dialogue about how they could come together and recommend common measures? I assume that it would be a major undertaking to redesign the data collection process and it would be good to have them involved somehow because they are on the ground dealing with the realities there, and I feel that this would be valuable to us. Another issue is the MACC system and where we are with that. I keep hearing, as I did again this morning, concern about the reliability of the data collection reporting system, and that is fundamental to this state achieving what we want it to achieve, and I think that at some point we need to get that system working or move on. I would like to know as a council member where we are. I know we have had lots of frustrations with it, but its been several years, I think, in the making and we have just got to get a handle on that and get something that our local folks can rely on and that the state can rely on to do reporting at the federal level.

Mr. Davis reported that the latest version of the VWN system, formerly known as MACC because there were four states working together in a consortium, is moving forward. Virginia has removed itself from that consortium at this point. We are moving forward with the latest product that was developed by the consortium and we have accepted delivery of it and it has been tested internally. We are doing a series of larger training sessions in Chester next month at a community college site. We have had one smaller training session and the feedback has been good. The test site will be up as the training goes on so that locals can get on to the training site and play around with it some more and then it is expected to go live in November.

Chair Connelly asked for a follow up report on the VWN system at the next Council meeting, including what problems we maybe have solved and which ones we haven't.

Mr. Ferraro asked if it were possible to get additional information from the 12 WIBs that did not respond before the November systems measures session. Mr. Davis said he could ask again. Mr. Ferraro indicated that it is just as important to know if its not being tracked, as it is to know what is being looked at, before we go into November so if there is any way to find out why the other twelve dropped out, I would appreciate it.

Another member indicated that it would also be helpful if we had some examples from other states. The person from Oregon may share that, but I would like to see it in advance of the meeting if possible, so we can kind of pour over it and start thinking. Dr. Bolin indicated that Council members will be sent a package of information before the November session and we will include as much as we can from as many states as we can, because every state is wrestling with this issue.

Another member stated that there is not much information being accumulated and it is certainly not consistent throughout the state. One of the things that comes to mind here is if somebody got placed in a job that paid \$12.40 an hour—what is the follow up period? In other words, was it a month long job, a three month long job, a six month long job? And, are the WIBs required to do follow up and check in once in a while to see, are they really permanent positions that we understand to be permanent in this society? Mr. Davis responded that is something that, as a system measure, this Council could define. It was requested that this issue be put that on the table when the Council gets to that point. The Chair agreed.

Vice Chair Daniels remarked that he was recently told me that Virginia had the largest increase in the percentage of job growth in July I think it was of any state in the country. Additionally, I

was asked if I thought whether that's related to anything that's being done in the workforce effort in the Commonwealth. I can give them different reasons why the answer is "yes" to that, but what would your answer to that question be if somebody asked you for hard measures that you can relate the fact that we were number 1 in July or we would be number 1 in three months out of the year of every state in the country—can we even do that to prove that any of this is working to help us in job creation?

Mr. Davis responded that he has to think that the programs are part of what is making a difference and that the programs together, creating a system are assisting that number, but I don't have any way of tying facts to it right now.

Vice Chair Daniels said that he was struck when that question was asked and I gave them what I thought was an appropriate answer as a result of all of the work that everybody is doing in the state. When we have our meeting on the 18th and 19th, one thing that would be interesting to me is, if we do have other people come in like Oregon and others, what measures are they using? Where for instance they can say to senior elected officials in their state, you know, "We have been able to track this for the past year or two and this program or this set of programs are simply not working, so therefore we believe that they should be shut down and the money should be reallocated to these five programs that are clearly indicating to us that they do work." So I'd just like to hear a little bit about that because I for one think we need it, and I know it is very difficult for all of us, but I think we need to move towards some of those measures as much as we possibly can, and other peoples' experience might be interesting.

Dr. Bolin indicated that clearly we are helping a lot of people, but can we attribute that increase and the improvement to the economy to the system? We need to look at the sort of people that we are helping, the level of people that we are helping and then compare that with the fact that there are a lot of employers out there who do not know about the system and therefore do not utilize it. We have to be very careful about doing "cause and effect" things here. We have a lot of work to do in terms of improving awareness of the system or maybe the image of the system, and then once we do that, we will be able to say "the system is honestly helping."

IX. Options for WIA Incentives Policy, Dr. Barbara Bolin, Special Advisor to the Governor for Workforce Development

Dr. Bolin remarked that Council members were sent a copy of the current WIA Incentives Policy in their meeting package. The Council adopted the policy in December 2000 and amended the policy in March 2002. Since the Council is focused on building a system, it seems appropriate to consider the policy in that context. Dr. Bolin handed out a matrix, which is a review of the original policy with comments on possible areas for improvement/change in the policy. If you will notice under policy elements in the handout on the first page, it says: "the title of the policy speaks to the Workforce Investment Act, but the policy purpose statement speaks to the workforce development system." These are two different things. So one of the first things the Council might want to do is to align the title and the purpose because there is a disconnect. I think if the Council is going to award any sort of incentives then the Council needs to have that as the purpose of the policy. I think it is time to review this policy and maybe any other policies out there that are currently in existence in terms of this change, because it is a significant change and we are bringing other partners into the system and it is starting to function more as a system than it was before.

I can't express enough the importance that I place on system performance as opposed to programmatic performance, and I think that the Council can do something to improve this policy to reflect that. You will notice that the existing policy states that the performance management system will focus on exemplary performance, local coordination, and regional cooperation, and the question that begs to be asked is, are these the only behaviors to incent; are there other things out there; maybe the Council could broaden that or update it? Again, the performance measures in the policy are the WIA performance measures and we are a long way past that and the Council ought to be looking at system measures. The policy contains a non-monetary award, which is a joint recognition by the Governor, the General Assembly and the VWC, to a WIB that meets the Malcolm Baldrige criteria for performance excellent. That could be broadened. Should WIBs be the only possible recipients of that award since we are talking system-wide? There is a long bulleted list of criteria that are used to evaluate the WIBs for this award. I think the Council ought to take a look at those criteria to determine if they are still applicable and should more be added. The question is, is the Council measuring the right thing and are we rewarding desired behavior?

The policy also states that the Governor must take corrective action with WIBs who fail to meet negotiated performance levels for two consecutive years. I don't know how the WIBs are doing currently in that regard. I do know that VEC currently collects all of that data, but I don't believe that we have seen it. If that's in the policy, the Council ought to be looking at it. There is also a list of various corrective actions. If a WIB has missed a performance measure for two years in a row, then the Governor has the right under this policy to take corrective actions. I think that the Council has an opportunity and a responsibility to update the policy because we have come a long way, particularly in the last couple of years or so, and the Council should update this policy to better reflect the sort of behavior that this Council now expects.

Dr. Bolin also provided a second handout to stimulate discussion. I think we ought to reward system building as well as continuous improvement, so this is just my thoughts with some recommendations. Chair Connelly asked Mr. Copenhaver's Committee to consider Dr. Bolin's recommendations. Mr. Copenhaver indicated that the Metrics & Incentives Committee will meet on November 19, 2004, immediately after the Council's Systems Measures session, because we feel like there is going to be a significant hand-off from the Council to our committee and we are prepared to shoulder the responsibility, so yes, it is something that we can help with and work on.

Mr. Copenhaver further commented that he agreed that it is time to review this policy and bring it into the context of the Council's current focus. However, we have some past business that we need to take care of today. The Council had agreed to award incentive funds and 2 WIBs applied for PY 2002 awards, but because of the State's budget constraints, the funds were not available for the awards, although the WIBs had gone through the established process. But, we have not made the awards. So, the Council has a credibility problem and if we are going to have a successful system going into the future, we are going to have to stand up and take responsibility for incenting what is required. A question was asked as to whether the WIA requires that incentives be awarded to WIBs? Ms. Robinson responded that the WIA requires that a portion of the 15% statewide discretionary funds be used for WIB incentives and each state decides the dollar amount. The state did have a budget problem year, but the Council voted to award incentives for PY 2003, which is the year that ended June 30th 2004.

Mr. Copenhaver indicated that the Council has no applications for the PY 2003, because of the feeling of apathy within the WIBs. Two qualified in PY 2002, submitted applications, thought they were set up to receive the grants, and then we rescinded the funds at the end of the

program. So, I would like to propose to the Council that we fund, not the total \$300,000, but fund \$150,000 of that WIA money and split it between the two workforce investment boards that applied in program year 2002. Dr. Bolin indicated that was an excellent compromise. Dr. Bolin also asked for a point of clarification on the status of the \$300,000 that was in the budget for last year, as she thought there was an expenditure of \$184,000. Ms. Esser indicated that there were no expenditures against that line item last year. A question was asked if there was carryover money? Ms. Esser responded that when we did the new budget, it was still kept at \$300,000 in this year's budget, so the whole budget included whatever funds, including the carry-over, was budgeted, so it was just \$300,000. Therefore, the Metrics & Incentives Committee knew that only \$150,000 could be awarded for PY 2002, and \$150,000 for PY 2003. We are left with the dilemma that we had no applications for 2003.

Mr. Copenhaver made a motion for the Council to honor the PY 2002 incentive awards. The 2 WIBs are Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads. The motion was seconded and approved.

X, Career Readiness Certificate – Rhonda Hodges, Coordinator of Workforce Development, Patrick Henry Community College

Ms. Hodges provided a handout and explained that most of their service area is in WIB 17, which is the Danville/Martinsville area. Ms Hodges mentioned the workforce challenges facing that region, regarding high unemployment and relatively low educational attainment. Becky Aydlett, the WIB 17 Director approached the two community colleges that serve the region, Danville Community College and Patrick Henry Community College, earlier this year to develop a workplace readiness program. We also knew that we wanted to make Governor Warner's Career Readiness Certificate a foundation of our program, to address those skills in reading for information, applied mathematics, and locating information, and we knew that we wanted it then to be an outcome of our program so that our participants and our residents could receive Governor Warner's Certificate.

Patrick Henry's approach to the program was to identify two target audiences, which are the unemployed, and the under employed; i.e., a growing population of our residents who are not earning a self-sufficiency wage. The program consists of non-credit and credit components. Non-credit components are those that have variable hours. The first part is a structured to inform participants that this is a rigorous program and the challenges involved, including the TABE locator exam. If a participant is not reading at a fifth-grade level, they will be referred to adult literacy instead of enrolling them the program, because we do want them to be unsuccessful. Key Train, which is a computer based training program that is online, and it is directly correlated to the WorkKey skills will be used. Participants will close the skill gaps in the three skill areas of Reading, Math, and Locating Information. However, they may be those who do not need Key Train of a lot of hour on Key Train. So that will be a variable component that runs concurrently with our college credit course.

The credit component includes a three credit hour class-that's 45 hours of instruction and the WorkKeys assessments. We will do initial pre-assessment at start of the program and then we will do counseling to assist in developing individual development plans, set realistic goals for where they want to be at the end of this program, for what level of the certificate they want to target, and for where they want to go in their career. We are also including the Tech Exam II certification training. The Tech Exam II is a computer certification exam for Virginia's private colleges. It includes a computer literacy certification, called workforce certification. The certification components are general computing concepts, word processing concepts, spreadsheet concepts, and Internet concepts. We have had a successful program at Patrick

County with the Tech Exam and the Patrick County Education Foundation. We have had close to 200 people who have received the Tech Exam II certifications through a program that we call Tech Advantage. So we are including this in our career readiness program as well.

Additionally, employers want attention paid to interpersonal or soft skills. We are including 7 modules on areas such as taking responsibility to meet your employer's expectations, being a team player, communication skills, and managing work and life priorities. Participants will go through an assessment to determine their key behavior profile and then we will talk about how important it is to understand behaviors as you are interacting in the workplace. And finally, of course, preparation for employment. We want them to be able to complete an application and to develop a very professional resume, to handle themselves well through the job search, and through the interviewing process. We knew we wanted the program to be fairly short-term training, so there's a nine-week session, where participants meet for approximately 6 hours per week, and then a seven-week session where they are meeting approximately 8 hours per week. To recruit participants, we are establishing referral systems with our One-Stop Centers and marketing to get the word out. At the end of the program, the completers will be able to earn Governor Warner's Career Readiness Certificate, Tech Exam II Workforce Certification, and a Certificate of Completion from Patrick Henry Community College.

XI. LEO/WIB Video Conferences & Upcoming Regional Follow Up Meetings, Gail Robinson, Staff

Last month, the Council sponsored, in conjunction with the Virginia Economic Development Association (VEDA), a 2-hour videoconference on September 10th and 17th at all 23 of the Community Colleges. On the 17th, we had to cancel three or four because of bad weather and on the 10th, we had technical difficulties at one site. The evaluation results for September 10th videos were sent in your meeting package. The topic was: Advancing Local Economic Development Using the WIA. The purpose was twofold: first, the Council's recognition that one of the key players at the local level in building workforce systems, the Local Elected Officials (LEOs), needed much more attention in Virginia to strengthen the LEO/WIB partnership. Second, was to also recognize that economic development is a major piece of what it is the Council is trying to do with workforce development, and I think the comments you made earlier, Mr. Daniels, sort of reflects that some how or another we need to be able to say some things about that, and the systems measures will get at that also.

The target audience was the LEOs, WIB Chairs and Directors and economic development professionals. We had 261 people to register, a quarter of which were LEOs, a quarter were economic development professionals, a quarter were WIB reps, and a quarter were others. Let me share three very telling comments made on the evaluations by LEOs.

- In answer to the question of what follow-up is needed, one of the LEOs said, "Education of our entire board." So, I'm assuming he was a member of a board of supervisors.
- Another comment was, "If the program is ever going to be effectual, your message must be taken directly to the local governing bodies, that is the board of supervisors, the city councils, et cetera, because most of us are illiterate on this subject."
- And third, "As a local leader, I came away with a greater knowledge of key players in both economic development and the WIB. You should think about how to bring them together to make a difference in my community."

These comments alone are very compelling in terms of how the LEOs, themselves, feel about what it is they think the Council needs to keep on doing in this regard. In that vein, the next

steps are 6 regional meetings around the state in October and November for the same audience. WIB. The meetings will be held in Roanoke, Keysville, Weyers Cave (Blue Ridge Community College), Falls Church, Petersburg and Norfolk. We have already sent to Council members about these meetings. We hope you can at least attend one or more of these meetings so that you can really get a more practical sense of what the challenges are in the field for the LEOs in terms of understanding what their roles are and then there is the challenge to the WIBs in trying to make all of this happen with the LEOs and with economic development. These regional sessions are going to be "roll up your sleeves" sessions in trying to carve out some practical ways to move forward. After the six regional meetings, in the first half of next year, we will sponsor four sessions around the state for a 1-day course for WIB and economic development professionals. The US Department of Labor is providing money to fund one of these sessions.

This is just the beginning of a very challenging journey. At the 6 regional sessions, we will ask the participants to tell us what technical assistance follow up they will need from the Council. We will report that to you at the January meeting. One of the things that we are pleased about is the partnership with the City of Richmond that you heard about earlier, because the City is stepping up to the plate to work with the WIBs to make sure that this happens, and that's really what has to happen all around the state. So, I think that this is an excellent beginning, but I am sure that Mike's committee is going to be looking at the results of all of these activities, and this is something that we are going to just have to work at for a long time.

Mr. Sullenberger commented that he is a VEDA board member, as well as an LEO, in addition to being a Council member. We had some discussion about the videoconference at our VEDA board meeting. I don't disagree at all with anything that Gail has said here, but what I will say to you is that LEOs are a very tough audience. Getting them jazzed up like the people in this room are about this subject is hard when the mundane intricacies of day-to-day take precedence and workforce development doesn't excite LEOs. What gets them excited is jobs and you have got to equate the things that relate to what we are doing with workforce development and economic development to those things. One of the things that we would strongly suggest is that we make a more concerted effort to get to the county administrators and the city managers, because in most cases they are going to be making strong recommendations, and in most cases in Virginia, you will find some boards and city councils that are nothing more than rubber stamps for their county administrators and city managers, to convince them of the need for this kind of thing is really critical for this process. So, I think that we, and again, I am a strong advocate of what we are trying to do here and I think it is critical that we are successful in terms of the long-term effect, but I do feel that we need to sort of re-evaluate that and make some effort along those lines.

Ms. Robinson responded that City Managers and County Administrators have been targeted before, although not by the Council. There certainly is a lot more work to be done with that group, as they are key to success. We targeted LEOs this time because the WIBs have been saying to us repeatedly that that's a tough area for them to deal with and they needed the Council's assistance and so we targeted the LEOs in response to that. The City Managers and County Administrators are the full time professionals articulating city and countywide policy and the Council needs to mount a similar effort with that group. Ms. Robinson also mentioned that the facilitators did do a similar workshop at the Virginia Municipal League (VML) conference in Alexandria, the first week in October. An invitation was extended to VACO, but they didn't respond. The Council can continue to do that kind of thing.

Mr. Sullenberger added that if you went to the Virginia Association of County's (VACO) meeting next month and you polled all of the county supervisors throughout Virginia you would probably find that half of them couldn't tell you what the WIA or the WIBs are about at all. I've tried to conduct those kinds of meetings at VACO sessions, and I know what the interest level is and I agree that it's a struggle. But it's a struggle that is worthwhile and I think that we need to continue to pound away at it in an organized fashion.

A Council member mentioned that we have talked about marketing now for some time. The annual report that we were just shown today would make an excellent council resume, if you would, to take out on the road to VACO, and to the different organizations and to just use that as the beginning of our board resume. Mr. Sullenberger added that he agreed that we should try to continue to approach that venue. It might not be a good idea, if VACO has not warmly embraced it. I think just trying to force-feed something there probably is not going to be very successful. I was a part of an effort like that once before, so I think it just needs to be better orchestrated and you need, again, to get to the people that are making recommendations and decisions within those organizations. Usually, those are the administrative type folks.

Ms. Robinson indicated that 2500 copies of the annual report will be printed and county administrators and city managers are on the list of many stakeholders to receive the report.

Chair Connelly asked if this was the first time that the Council has done anything for the LEOs and WIBS. Ms. Robinson answered yes and it's all related to the direction the Council is going in strategically in focusing on key players, and in listening to the WIBs. The WIBs were a little skeptical all along because they are out there on a day-to-day basis. This is a hard, hard, area to deal with. There is no question about it. But, it's doable and the Council just needs to keep listening to the feedback and modifying the strategies.

XIII. Special Advisor Report, Dr. Barbara Bolin

Dr. Bolin provided an update on the Career Readiness Certificate. The Governor will be officially launching the Career Readiness Certificate at 10:00 – 11:00 am tomorrow in the Grand Ballroom right next door. All Council members have been invited. We have in excess of 5500 Virginians that are now eligible to receive the Career Readiness Certificate. We are going to have representatives from various constituencies in the audience. But, primarily, this is an economic development tool and at the end of the launch ceremony, the Governor will recognize five employers who have already invested a lot in their employees in terms of helping them get work keys assessments. There are two things that are exciting about this as an economic development tool. First is that we have partnered with VATECH, which is part of Christopher Newport University, and they are developing a query data base, which will be query by zip code, so that a potential employer, or anybody else in the region, who wants to see what the skill level is within that region can query the data base and that is a very powerful tool. We have worked with the VEDP as a partner on that also to enable us to be able to create that database, and it will be up and running this year.

Also, in the Governor's speech tomorrow, he reference the consortium of states, which now number 13 states that are committed to working with us in a consortium. The important thing is that this will be a truly portable skills credential that will be accepted and valued across a large chunk of the United States. There are seven more states that are interested in joining the consortium and I contacted four more just last week to see whether they are interested. I think we are the first in terms of the way we are going to use it and the extent to which we are going

to use it. I also have a commitment from DRS , DSS, and the Department of Corrections to assist their clients in getting this certificate.

There is a \$20,000 budget in the budget for the CRC. I think it is costing about \$5,000 or so to have the first 11,000 certificates printed, and it is costing us \$10,500 for the VA TECH database. This is one of the wonderful partnerships that Dr. Rose Johnson would have talked to you about. The Virginia Community College System has agreed to take responsibility for implementing and making operational this process, which means that when that first 11,000 certificates are given out, then they will find a way to get more printed and so on, so I think it is a very low cost to the state. The assessments are very inexpensive. Not only are many of them available online, but they are also available on CD Rom. So, for example, if you've got a One-Stop Center, for \$100 they can buy the CD Rom, and then they can simply put as many people as they want through the assessment. So it has become an extraordinary affordable credential. The training is either online, as Rhonda told you, or they can go to the Community College to get the training. But really, to take the assessments, it is terribly inexpensive now, so that is a very positive thing that you have been able to do to support Virginians.

Chair Connelly asked what next steps are planned to promote or expand the initiative and what can be done to get the Virginia Workforce Network Centers more interested?

Dr. Bolin indicated that the Governor wants to institutionalize CRC. I provided the Governor with a marketing plan with a cost of \$100,000. There is a great deal that you could be doing for free that we have already been doing, and obviously, those things will be ongoing. One of the things that I thought might be a neat idea is to actually incent the Virginia Workforce Network Centers by giving each of them a grant and giving them six months to see how many people they can get to have the CRC with that grant, and then at the end of the six months issue a prize to the WIB that comes out on top. That's all part of the \$100,000 and I'm waiting to hear back from the Governor's office. The Governor has done some PSAs and you will be seeing him on television talking about this later in the year. In November, I will be doing a 60-minute television show on PBS, which will consist of 30 minutes of myself answering questions from the media, and 30 minutes of dealing with phone ins/calls, and then PBS will make the taping available to all PBS stations across the Commonwealth. Assuming that goes well, it could be a really good thing. But there are lots of things like that which we can do at no cost. However, I do think that incenting the WIBs to take an active role is probably a really good idea and that would cost \$52,500 out of the \$100,000 if it were to take place.

Dr. Fletcher Mangum for Dr. Rose Johnson, Vice Chancellor for Workforce Development, Virginia Community College System

Dr. Johnson was called away to a meeting with the Governor and sends her regrets. She has asked me to fill in for her to tell you about an exciting project about cluster analysis. Dr. Johnson approached the VEDP to suggest a partnership between VCCS and VEDP where VCCS would move forward with occupation clusters, which in tandem with the industry clusters would provide a very, very powerful analytical tool. An industry cluster can be defined an economic development tool, and it is an empirical process that groups industries together based on their characteristics in terms of who they buy from and who they sell to. For a specific region, the economic developers tried to fill out the cluster by recruiting industries that are closely related to the industries that are already there. Occupational clusters are very new, particularly when used in an applied sense like this, and this actually does put Virginia very much in the forefront in this area. What an occupation cluster is, is the same empirical analysis, but grouping occupations on the basis of the skills and training that are required for

that specific occupation. To date, what we have been able to accomplish with VEDP is moving forward at a regional level with each one of the WIBs to produce an industry cluster analysis for each one of the WIBs. VCCS has contracted with my firm to produce the occupation cluster analysis and we have completed that based on ACT and ONET or Bureau of Labor Statistics data, and are now in the process of moving forward to do that analysis at the regional level.

The other advantage to this is that as you empirically link industries, occupations, and the skills that are required for each one of the occupations, it provides something of a universal translator between the traditional industry-based world of economic development and the human-capital world of education. It tells you empirically how those link, and through the clusters and in sort of an indentional sort of way. The hope is to be able to put this information eventually into an interactive web interface, which would allow economic developers from across the state to access this and to answer exactly the kinds of questions that we could pose for example, as to what other industries would be viable alternatives to the textile industry within a region.

XIV. Committee Reports

Chair Connelly provided an update on the Executive Committee, which at its last meeting discussed two items. One was the Annual Report to the Governor and the second item was an grant application to the US Department of Labor (DOL) for the PY 2004 Workforce Information Core Products and Services Grant. Dr. Bolin was asked to explain the grant. Dr. Bolin explained that the state is required to do a plan every year and this year DOL made some changes in that they wanted this to become more of a partnership between the state agency, which is the VEC, and the State Council. Several interdisciplinary meetings were held between my office and the VEC. The VEC took the lead on it because they have done the plan every year. So, we were able to include the basic VEC grant and make some additions to it. Workforce information is a new term that DOL is using to define any data that you can think of that might inform the workforce system. The grant amount is \$825,000.

Chair Hugh Keogh reported next for the Awareness and Confidence Committee. On September 15th, the Committee approved 3 marketing pilots for the Roanoke, Region 2000 and Northern VA WIBS. Those pilots will involve a broad range of media and public relations activities, and also will include a summit meeting of some kind to lift the visibility and the awareness of the network and the WIA to all of our employers.

Chair Daniel LeBlanc of the Integration & Alignment Committee indicated that there was no report but that there is a vacancy on the Committee to fill Mayor Dance's slot. Ms. Robinson indicated that the Secretary of the Commonwealth's Office is working on the replacement for Mayor Dance.

Chair Michael Ferraro reported for the Key Player Effectiveness Committee. At the last Committee meeting, a decision was made to update the Council's conference calendar on the web site to make it more user friendly. The council is currently supporting and paying for council members to go to conferences throughout the country and locally. Council members received a document in their meeting package titled "Summary of Results of State Institutes for Workforce Professional Training." Currently, there are 20 states that have some type of professional development program for those who work within the workforce system. Our goal at our next meeting in December is to assess what is currently happening in Virginia in the area of workforce development for workforce professionals, both volunteers and paid staff, and we are going to come back to you in January with a recommendation of a model of what that might

look like. Under the Supporting Learning Opportunities; we are advising the governor's conference on Workforce Development, which has been postponed and will be rescheduled. You heard about the LEO/WIB videoconferences and the follow-up sessions that are going to happen again.

Chair Andrea Wooten reported for the Local Excellence Committee and the primary agenda item at their last meeting was the review the WIB strategic plans and the Committee is recommending approval of those, which was done earlier in the meeting. We also discussed how to move forward with helping the Virginia Workforce Network Centers and WIBs become more effective, because that is our charge, and we came to the conclusion that we needed to do, and we may be having some overlap in terms of our committees. We will have to work with the Key Player Effectiveness Committee on this, but our first recommended path is to assess, with the help of the local WIB and the Virginia Workforce Network Center staff their training needs. We are very interested in establishing some sort of a peer-to-peer support system within the state, but I would like to have direct input from the local staff on that to see if that is something that they would welcome or be receptive to.

Mr. Ferraro responded that most states have some type of advisory board that either sets direction or makes recommendations to their state institute on what type of learning, whether it is classroom, online, et cetera. The Key Player Effectiveness Committee plans to put forward a model of an advisory board or of a committee that is going to be the advisory board for our learning institution.

Ms. Wooten continued by saying that other thing that the Committee talked about was the need to basically develop a resource map, which would again be dovetailing what the Key Player Effectiveness Committee is doing.. Not only available classroom training, but online training as well, that could be accessed at the local level. We also discussed the need to meet directly with the WIB Directors, which I am planning to do next month to get feedback on some of these issues. Hopefully, that is something that both of our committees can use as we move forward, both as the local excellence and the key player effectiveness initiative. Also, we are very anxious to have a replacement assigned to our committee since Katherine has departed because we have lots of things that we would like to have done, so hopefully that will happen soon.

XV. Council Member Comments – Chair Connelly

Mr. Ferraro indicated that the state MOU has a year shelf life and it is supposed to end in November and be revised. There were nine goals and maybe Mr. LeBlanc's Committee could take a look at the nine goals in the state MOU, which is really alignment and integration, and then maybe come back to us and let us know what is going on with the state MOU and what progress has been made with the nine goals. Ms Robinson responded by indicating that one the things that is planned for the capacity building money this year is in response to a request made by Secretary Woods for statewide training for all partners to the MOU. All of the partners really don't have an understanding of the MOU, so we are going to have a big statewide meeting for all of the partners and bring them in, and divide the MOU into about 9 training modules so that we can train all of the partners on the MOU. We feel that we will be in a better place to respond to the goals after this is done. We will let the Council know when the training is scheduled.

Dr. Bolin followed up on Andrea Wooten's comment about Committee staff. The staff person we lost was from the VCCS. We have an MOU with the VCCS to fund a staff person to

support Andrea's committee and another committee. We are required in the Code to have three staff agencies., i.e., the VEC, VCCS and DBA. So, we are down two staff people. So, this is an issue that I am raising.

Chair Connelly brought the Council's attention to the Certificate of Recognition for Senator Hawkins from the Governor that was sent to members in their meeting package. Chair Connelly went on to remind members of the systems performance measures session on November 18-19, 2004 and the next Council business meeting is January 6, 2005 and we are going to change that location from Northern Virginia to Richmond. She concluded by summarizing the topics that were discussed today as potential agenda items for the January meeting. Those items are:

- Semi-annual performance metrics review.
- Out put from the systems performance measures session in terms of what we have decided or where we are in the process of deciding that.
- An integrated statewide demand plan.
- An update on the VWN computer system, get a better sense for how that is going and of what problems we have solved;
- Possibility of looking at a revised incentive proposal, including addressing corrective action—is there a recommendation that we need to be making to the Governor in regard to corrective action around any areas that are perpetually missing performance. Additional comments were made regarding the possibility of a rapid response team to assist the WIB to provide assistance, so that they come up to standards. This could be part of corrective action.
- State MOU review

Chair Connelly adjourned the meeting at 12:10 pm.